



California Coastal Commission
Central Coast District Office

Monterey County Local Coastal Plan Periodic Review – Compilation of Synopsis of Issues

Index to abbreviations for Geographic Areas:

- (CW) = County-wide
- (NC) = North County
- (DMF) = Del Monte Forest
- (CC) = Carmel Coastal
- (BS) = Big Sur

WATER QUALITY & SUPPLY

- Review appropriate Land Use Plan (LUP) designation for Watertek (wastewater treatment plant) holdings outside of wetlands (including spray fields around plant) (NC)
- Dredging and dredge disposal at Moss Landing Harbor, Old Salinas River Channel and Tembladero Slough - upland disposal, offshore disposal (NC)
- Consideration of new/alternate technologies for water supply and wastewater treatment in remote or rural areas (BS)
- Update non-point source pollution prevention policies (CW)
- Review Non-Point Source Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II requirements for reducing non-point source stormwater runoff - do they apply? Are there adequate implementation policies (e.g. requiring on-site retention/mgt. of runoff, enhanced engineering solutions (e.g. treatment units), or enhanced “natural” systems (e.g. created wetlands, ponds, filter strips) (DMF)
- Compliance with Clean Water Act/Regional Board water quality protection policies (CW)
- Water quality protection; nitrate contamination; seawater intrusion (CW)
- Consider effective stormwater ordinances/controls to prevent degradation of fish habitat (e.g. increased stream flows during/after storm events) (CW)
- Need non-point source discharge standards in LCP (CC)
- Integrate Sanctuary’s Water Quality Protection Program where appropriate, into the LCP (CW)
- Use water reclamation to increase water supply, but reduce volume of water discharge into marine waters (CW)
- The LCP Review should address the coastal watershed issues including but not limited to: watershed monitoring efforts including volunteer quality monitoring; the status of water quality in local creeks & streams as well as coastal waters; pollution prevention efforts including methods of reducing or eliminating agricultural runoff and urban runoff; impacts of future development on water quality; impacts of flood protection projects (e.g. Pajaro River, Tembledaro Slough) on water quality; impacts associated with point sources such as municipal sewage treatment facilities, desalination facilities, aquaculture operations etc. (CW)
- Current water supply availability relative to existing population and planned growth; link growth with water availability (SW)
- Overdraft in Carmel River aquifer - withdrawals exceeding state standards (CC)



- Water shortages in Sycamore Canyon; projects are approved on a project-by-project basis, not looking at the long-term cumulative effects of water supply issues (BS)(P); Lagoon at mouth of Big Sur River – Molera Park. State Water Resources Board application to take 1800 acre feet from the river, which is supposed to be protected (BS)
- Impact of landslide materials on water quality (review/incorporate CHMP recommendations) (BS)
- Use of septic systems and impacts on water quality from septic system failure (BS)
- Flood Control District management of water resources - degrading water quality & groundwater quality – possible use of flushing flows to maintain WQ & sediment supply to the coast (NC)
- Cumulative impacts of development and restoration projects in Elkhorn Slough watershed (NC)
- Effect of golf course management practices on water quality (DMF)
- Water quality of all coastal watersheds between the San Luis Obispo/Monterey county line and the Carmel River (BS)
- Groundwater recharge and water quality protection through preservation of wetlands, riparian areas and aquifer recharge areas (CW)
- Beach closures and implications for water quality and public access – Stillwater cove (CC)
- Does Sanctuary designation protect coastal waters from cruise ship dumping? (CW)
- Watershed site coverage limits designed to protect water quality in areas of special biological significance (e.g., Pescadero Watershed site coverage limits) (DMF)
- Dredging of Tembladero Slough with respect to water quality and aquatic habitat (NC)
- Introduction of diseases and contaminants via all routes into near-shore waters, as well as watershed management (CW)
- There appears to be inadequate information on the pollution entering Monterey Bay. This should be addressed with a complete monitoring system to identify onshore contributors (CW)
- Polluted, chlorinated water entering ocean from Big Sur River (BS)
- Desalination plants can have harmful impacts from discharge of excessive brine & other contaminants if not sited & designed properly (CW)
- The proper siting and minimization of impacts from oceanic fiber optic cables which will connect w/shore-based telecommunications facilities (CW)

ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITAT AREAS

- Update mapping of environmentally sensitive habitats (CW)
- Update endangered species list and maps of critical habitat areas (CW)
- Uniformly treat and protect maritime chaparral as an environmentally sensitive habitat (CW)
- Update list of sensitive plant/animal species for dune habitat areas (CW)
- Update environmentally sensitive habitat list (DMF)
- Consider all known habitat, current or historical, for Federally listed species such as Smith's blue butterfly, south-central steelhead trout, red-legged frog, etc that occurs within the coastal zone between the SLO/Monterey county line and the Carmel River. (BS, CC)



- Incorporate method to continually update info on endangered species and habitat areas classified as ESHA (CW)
- Protect landmark trees (NC, CC)
- Do not allow lighting shining out on the Sanctuary waters (CW)
- Clarify that no new parcels should be created that have no building site outside of sensitive habitat areas (NC)
- Require one-to-one mitigation and/or requirement of in-lieu fees for unavoidable development in environmentally sensitive habitat (e.g., maritime chaparral and oak woodland) (NC)
- Non-native tree removal when it serves as habitat (Policy 32) (DMF)
- Require biotic report recommendations to be consistent with all applicable plan policies (BS)
- Development in sensitive habitat areas only allowed if development is dependent on the habitat (BS)
- Limit building in environmentally sensitive areas (CW)
- Review appropriate LUP designation for Long Valley acquisition area (NC)
- Consider preference for natural vs. hard structures within and adjacent to riparian channels, evaluate where such structures are permitted; include requirement to consider and analyze alternatives to hard structures (CW)
- Inadequate buffers to avoid new development too close to streams (CW)
- Dependence on riparian vegetation for delineation of riparian buffers (CW)
- Resource management and environmentally sensitive protection policies should be consistent throughout the coastal zone (CW)
- Allow for natural geological and shoreline processes to occur along the Big Sur coast and allow implementation of LCP to be flexible to recognize different management approaches for landslide; review (no) seawall policy (BS)
- Protection of environmentally sensitive habitat areas should not preclude or limit public use/enjoyment of these areas (CW)
- Protect sensitive species (e.g., snowy plover, Smith's blue butterfly) from predation of non-native predators through implementation of US Fish & Wildlife Service Predator Management Plan for the Salinas River National Wildlife Refuge. Other benefits include securing roosting and feeding habitat for the endangered California brown pelican, endangered California least tern, and other birds. (NC)
- Consultation and coordination with Federal and State land managers within the coastal zone to ensure maximum resource and habitat protection. (CW)
- Precautionary measures should be taken to protect snowy plovers from impacts associated with public access and large public events (CW)
- Review adequacy of tree removal and replacement policies in all land use plan areas; make consistent (CW)
- Management practices of planting invasive species along Highway One corridor (e.g., planting iceplant along Hwy 1 in Fort Ord corridor to inhibit blowing sand) (NC)
- Adequacy of LUP designations in areas with current wetland delineations (especially for Moro Cojo Slough) (NC)
- Preservation of Pescadero Canyon (DMF)



- Setbacks for protecting terrestrial ESHA? (i.e. dune buckwheat, and various upland habitats/species, etc.) (BS)
- Impacts from beach grooming (CC)
- Invasive species in Big Sur area leading to biological problems (BS)
- Remaining sand dunes are constantly under threat from development. Needs to be more clear prohibitions on development and indiscriminate public use (CW)
- No more seawalls because they have a bad effect on wildlife and habitats, water quality, and beach access (CW)
- Effects of commercial livestock grazing on sensitive resources and habitat within the coastal zone; necessary steps to protect from degradation. (CW)
- Appropriate buffers to protect/preserve biological integrity and ecologic function of streams (CW)
- Impacts of polluted runoff into creeks/rivers that support or have historically supported Steelhead runs (CW)
- Protection of Monarch Butterfly over-wintering sites in Monterey County (CW):
- Protect beach and dunes on Moss Landing Island as sensitive habitat (NC)
- Shoreline Management Plan for Moss Landing (NC)
- Establish management protocols for maritime chaparral & conservation easements (NC)
- Consider classifying Monterey pine as a sensitive species and provide methodology to dealing with protection, loss, and removal/handling of material infected with pitch canker (CW)
- Protect Pescadero Canyon (DMF)
- Review measures for allowing Monterey pine removal throughout County's coastal zone (CW)
- Del Monte Forest management is important (DMF)
- Cumulative impact of fire management requirements on sensitive habitat areas (e.g., fire clearing buffers in maritime chaparral and Monterey pine forest habitats) (CW)
- Re-evaluate the build-out capacity & perform analyses of resource trends and conditions (for forests, water quality, shoreline access, ESHA, sensitive species, coastal bluffs, uplands, watersheds, dunes etc.) in DMF (DMF)
- Additional golf course and commercial housing proposal in Del Monte Forest will impact/eliminate last remaining stands of forest (CC)
- Conflicts between CDF rules for road construction vs. LCP policies to minimize/avoid environmental impacts (BS)
- Consider use of habitat conservation plans and multi-species habitat protection programs in coordination with habitat protection policies in LCP for purpose of preserving, protecting and enhancing sensitive habitat areas consistent with coastal act requirements. (NC; CW)
- Tidal scour & channel widening in Elkhorn Slough and other tidal wetlands in North County (NC)
- Restoration of previously mined dune areas in Del Monte Forest (DMF)
- Individual Forest Management Plans vs. Regional Forest Management Plans to form consistent management approach to protect and preserve forest resources (DMF)
- Evaluate appropriate land use designations for areas in Del Monte Forest (DMF)



- In lieu fees, mitigation bank, preservation of seed stocks as possible ways for mitigating removal/loss of Monterey pine – incorporate information from latest research (DMF)
- Consider a regional approach to coastal armoring to minimize trends towards increasing hard armoring of the shoreline, which can impact Sanctuary resources, reduce recreational access, and alter sand supply dynamics. This should include evaluation of coastal erosion and beach nourishment trends, identification of likely future sites for armoring requests and their impacts, consideration of alternative approaches to reduce the need for armoring, and identify sensitive areas where armoring may not be appropriate. A proactive approach to coastal armoring should be included in the LCP to minimize the need for emergency requests which can lead to approval of inappropriate structures (CW)
- Consider potential for beach nourishment landward of Moss Landing north and south spit (NC)
- Cumulative impact analysis of forest composition, health and coverage since certification of LCP (DMF)
- Preserve/restore spawning habitat for anadromous species; represents critical habitat for Sanctuary species (CW)
- Protection of fish and wildlife habitat areas/wildlife corridors (CW)
- Continue coordination with Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) on the Elkhorn Slough Watershed Management project which is designed to reduce high levels of pesticides found in the Elkhorn Slough Watershed by controlling sediments from agricultural land and reduce the degradation of wetlands and riparian habitats resulting from sedimentation deposition. The project includes the use of BMPs recommended by the U.S. EPA to protect wetland and riparian habitats. (NC)
- Clarify on whether HCP/NCCP will or will not be appropriate –indicate in LCP as requirement or prohibition (CW)
- Incorporation of GIS technology into biological, archaeological and geologic/geotechnical reports –to deal with temporal and spatial components of data, base maps, scales and projections, and locating by latitude/longitude for certain species & resource locations (CW)
- Loss of permeable surfaces (CW)
- Destruction of the coast (CW)
- Consider biological need for connectivity of habitat types (CW)
- Evaluate natural and agricultural resources threatened by agricultural and commercial development, including natural causes: Monterey Pine Pitch Canker, seawater intrusion, and degradation of water quality, loss of ecological services, fragmentation of habitats, forests (CW)
- Loss of biomass (CW)
- Noise pollution (CW)
- Impacts on the coastal zone from reuse of land at the former Fort Ord. This includes development in the areas west of Highway one (an area of deferred certification) as well as portions of Fort Ord outside of Commission's jurisdiction.
- Need more “wild” areas free from human use (no touch areas). Public access should be promoted with good facilities in selected locations and limited in other places (e.g., wetlands). (CW)
- Prevent destruction of fragile habitat areas (CW)
- Keep all development out of these areas (CW)
- Maintenance and repair activities until definitive solutions are found (BS)



- Damage to sea creatures from cruise ships (CW)

MARINE RESOURCES (COMMERCIAL & RECREATIONAL FISHING, BOATING)

- Include new MLML school site near cemetery and evaluate reuse/restoration of original site on Moss Landing Island (NC)
- Update existing facilities built since certification in Moss Landing Area (e.g., Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute (MBARI) and Moss Landing Marine Labs (MLML)) and review appropriate land use designations for these facilities. (NC)
- Continued access at Stillwater Cove for recreational boating and diving (DMF)
- Harbor dredging and potential impacts of upland, beach and offshore disposal and consider potential beneficial reuse of dredge disposal materials. (NC)
- Appropriate beach re-nourishment locations based on Shoreline Management Plan for Moss Landing Moss Landing Comprehensive Plan Update, conflicts between Research, Fishing & Recreation, Parking, and Public Access (NC)
Consider appropriate sites for public parking in Moss Landing area and on Moss Landing Island (NC)
- Assess impacts of Caltrans sediment management practices to minimize adverse impacts to marine resources – recommendations from Coast Highway Management Plan (BS)
- All possible efforts should be taken to conserve and protect fisheries from commercial abuse (CW)
- Disturbance to sea otters and other fauna by personal watercraft, effects of kelp harvesting, and impacts of cruise ships (CW)
- Ensure that commercial fishing and recreational boating operate within the restrictions necessary to preserve the Monterey Bay Sanctuary (CW)
- Replacement of Sandholdt Pier in Moss Landing (NC)
- Review kelp harvesting impact (DMF)
- Protection of marine resources through implementation of adequate water quality policies (CW)
- Impacts to marine resources from runoff (particularly golf courses) (DMF)
- Potential disruption of habitat values from use of personal water craft (CW)
- Boating, except those driven manually or wind driven, should be eliminated in the marine sanctuary (CW)
- Pollution seems to be causing havoc with the sea mammals (CW)
- Protect availability of aquatic food and the viability of the industry that brings it to market (CW)
- Fishing should be limited to the natural renewable supply (CW)

COASTAL HAZARDS (GEOLOGICAL HAZARDS, FLOODING SEISMIC)

- Minimize impacts from geologic hazards by requiring erosion controls best management practices (BMPs) (NC)



- Clarify whether private golf courses should be considered “public recreation facilities” and whether they should be provided same protection by Coastal Act as that granted to facilities open to the public (DMF)
- Clarify seawall prohibition standards for new development consistent with Coastal Act policy 30253 and for existing development consistent with 30235. (CW)
- Armoring not allowed to protect new development (i.e., new development must be designed and sited in such a way as to ensure that no armoring would be required, consistent with Coastal Act) (CW)
- No more seawalls along our coasts, preclude further development on cliffs and beaches (CW)
- Policy requiring easements on steep slopes greater than (25% or 30%) should apply countywide (BS)
- Castle projects to access beach near Point Lobos – blasting the sea rock to provide a tunnel? (CC)
- The Carmel river flood plain should not be invaded by any new building. The coastline should be fully off limits to structures, which need seawalls etc. to subsist. (CC)
- Establish shoreline structure requirements (materials, evaluation of alternatives, avoid blocking access, etc.) where allowed (NC; BS; DMF)
- Establish required format or specific items that must be included in geologic/geotechnical reports so that the key questions regarding shoreline protective devices can be readily provided and reviewed (CW)
- May need to identify “lifetime” restrictions on rebuilds, establish requirements for other types of alterations (e.g., remodels, relocation, partial or complete demolition, etc)(CW)
- Assess cumulative impacts of development in Pescadero Canyon (CC)
- Assess impacts of Caltrans sediment management practices to minimize geologic hazards along Highway One – recommendations from Coast Highway Management Plan (BS)
- Review Fire management requirements (CW)
- Review progress toward preparing required Watershed restoration area plans (North County 2.5.3.C.4.b) (NC)
- Management of flows in major rivers to maintain littoral sediment supply & water quality (NC)

AGRICULTURE

- Review appropriate land use designations for Triple M Ranch to reflect agricultural use and training facility (NC)
- Protect viable prime agricultural land not currently designated Agricultural Preservation or Agricultural Conservation (i.e., re-designate lands as necessary per policy 2.6.3.1 of NC LUP) (NC)
- Clarify the Commission and County’s regulatory responsibility regarding agriculture under the Coastal Act (CW)
- Assess if County followed LUP policies for agriculture buffers (CW)
- Review potential for “estatization” of ag lands (NC)
- Preservation of agricultural (ag) lands – agriculture is the primary industry of the county and needs to be preserved; conversion of ag lands is an important concern due to importance of agriculture to the area’s economy; evaluate trends in conversion of ag lands (CW)
- Increased ag buffers near schools to reduce potential health effects due to spraying (CW)



- Economic incentive process for developing, certifying and implementing particular management practices that are consistent with LCP resource protection policies (CW)
- Impacts of grazing management on native plant species diversity and coverage (CW)
- Runoff requirements for agriculture –appropriate buffers for specific geographic units (that share certain physical characteristics –wind patterns, type of ag, chemicals used etc). May lead to different buffer distances & requirements within buffers for different areas (CW)
- Limits of agricultural development/activity based on slope to reduce sediment erosion (NC)
- Dilemma of taking agricultural lands out of production in place of residential development to reduce water demands (which may lead to conversion of ag to residential) (NC)
- Agricultural overdraft of groundwater in North County, and subsequent salinity intrusion (NC)
- Low(er) water-demand crop production to reduce agricultural water consumption (NC)
- Mechanism in permitting process to address issues with regards to potential conversion of ag lands (e.g., during grading evaluations, well drilling application process, etc.) (CW)
- Recognize existing programs for on-site agriculture practices (e.g., managing agricultural activities, grading, etc.) to ensure resource protection. (CW)
- Ensure subdivisions and lot line adjustments do not adversely impact grazing (BS)
- Direct and indirect effect on agriculture from exempt activities, including construction of agricultural roads, grazing activities, and types of development on agricultural lands (CW)
- Conversion of ag land due to road construction & pressure for development (BS)

PUBLIC ACCESS/RECREATION

- Consider extension of bluff trail to Del Mar parking lot, 2nd restroom at south end of beach, parking restrictions along scenic areas; review continuation of Carmel City access policies into DMF and Carmel segments (CC)
- The LCP should evaluate sensitive coastal habitats which may be damaged by the promotion of public access and include mitigation measures; review plover policies (CW)
- Consider improvement of public access & parking in El Sur Ranch (BS)
- Consider improvement of public access & parking in Del Monte Forest (DMF)
- Review/consider policies to implement the California Coastal Trail (e.g. acquisition/installation), standards for trail by segment, access/resource conflicts (e.g.. dune trails) (CW)
- Include continuous public trails (paths, sidewalks) through Moss Landing (determine route along Moss Landing Road or atop Salinas River dike, across Highway 1 Bridge and through North Harbor area. – coordinate with Moss Landing Harbor District, Dept of Public Works and others) (NC)
- Assess policies for public access: (1) ensure that all requirements have been met; (2) identify areas where additional access desired; (3) insert it into LCP with trigger to initiate: Parking in lodge areas, Signage for trails, Ensure public welcome (DMF)
- Evaluate adequacy of signage for existing trails (BS)



- Consider public access easements across private lands to either the beach or other public lands within the coastal zone a priority of the LCP (BS)
- Coastal Commission is biased toward public ownership of land (BS)
- Protection of coastal resources and public access is a local planning issue (CW)
- Prevent destruction of important public recreational areas (CW)
- Prevent overuse of coastal areas due to increase development along shoreline; maintain clean water for swimming [and ecosystems] (CW)
- Private lands are becoming public – private landowners are being bought out by state/feds. (BS)
- Open Space areas – some areas considered open space are actually the most intensely used property in the area and requires more services (BS)

SCENIC & VISUAL RESOURCES

- Consider including scenic easements over developments that should not become taller through future additions (BS)
- Consider requiring utilities to be placed underground in immediate coastal areas (CW)
- Assess view policies to determine if they need to be upgraded, including views from the ocean (see SLO PR) (CC)
- Cumulative effects of cellular towers; evaluate new technologies for their ability to reduce visual impacts (CW)
- Evaluate the public benefit of extending “critical viewshed” type policies to rural areas, and including a requirement for structural development in order to be hidden from the public viewshed (NC)
- Ridgetop development (CW)
- Determine if character policies are coordinated w/city LCP (CC)
- Consider establishing conservation and scenic easement management program (NC)
- Viewshed issues – evaluate signs and lighting in Big Sur area (BS)
- Assess the impacts of enclaves that permit development in viewshed and review interpretation of viewshed policies (BS)
- Evaluate visual impacts of forest canopy destruction from distant as well as local views (DMF)
- Analyze cumulative impacts and assess permit decisions associated with vegetation screening for blocking views (BS)
- Consider scenic and visual resources as seen not only from roads and highways but also from public access foot and equestrian trails on public lands within the coastal zone. Of particular concern is the area between the San Luis Obispo/Monterey county line and the Carmel River. (BS, CC)
- Ensure transfer of development rights (TDRs) or purchase funds continue to be available to purchase properties, which would otherwise be buildable, but are in public views or contain critical public habitat or sensitive resource areas. (CW)
- Please consider using the Coast Highway Management Plan (CHMP) as satisfying, in part, many of the scenic preservation objectives outlined w/in the LUP related to Highway 1 (BS)



- Recognize that necessary maintenance activities cannot be “invisible” from the highway [one]; this includes temporary and permanent features and construction activities (BS)
- Coordinate with Coast Guard regarding federal consistency authority over any proposed future antennae on the communications tower at Pt. Sur Light Station. (BS)
- Consider preserving habitats for visual reasons and define why its in the public interest (CW)
- Assess increased night lighting (NC)
- Coastal development insults the land by imposing human development structures which block views of creator’s gift (DMF, CC, BS)

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- These resources adjacent to or in the nearshore marine environment should be mapped and that information should be readily available to local jurisdictions/agencies to ensure these sites are not impacted by development or construction activities (CW)
- Consider all known archaeological sites within the coastal zone between the SLO/Monterey county line and the Carmel River. (BS, CC)
- Consider adding historic resource protection policies (NC)(CC)(DMF)
- Historically important housing should be protected as a part of the charm of the old cities and Del Monte Forest (CW)
- Sacred sites continue to be plagued by unknowing insensitive recreationalists (e.g. MDCC whose purpose to use some sites as borrow pits). Do not let them skate by w/minimal site surveys. Need to preserve archaeological sites for future generations and to teach younger generation the local history. Protection of these areas are okay as long as it does not reduce overall public use and/or enjoyment of these areas (CW)

ENERGY & INDUSTRIAL RESOURCES

- The Commission concurred with the USFS denial of oil and gas leases located in the Big Sur area. All leases contained highly erodible soils and slopes; all were in watersheds of coastal streams and contained habitat for the California least tern and Peregrine falcon. The lease applications would have adversely impacted environmentally sensitive habitat areas & water quality; generated development inconsistent with the recreational and view protection policies of the California Coastal Act; and mar the scenic vistas along Highway One and inland. (BS)
- Review appropriateness of mining of white sands (CC)
- Duke Energy must be monitored and held fully accountable for pollution to Elkhorn Slough and the outer bay (NC)
- Note Duke Energy ownership of Moss Landing Power Plant, change in operation and configuration of power generating units and tank farm removal (NC)
- Review marine resource mitigations impact (NC)
- Consider impacts of cooling technologies on Elkhorn Slough in light of dry cooling feasibility (CW)



- US Forest Service Land and Resource Management Plan allowed provision for Granite Rock Company to mine its claims within Big Sur. The Commission found that the activity had the potential to adversely affect access, recreation, visual, and habitat resources of the coastal zone. (BS)
- Energy and industrial resources should only be allowed after careful review relative to environment, traffic, water use, and quality of life issues (CW)
- Review energy demand and supply (NC)
- Our dependence on alien energy sources should preclude any additional restrictions on current or planned energy sources (CW)

DEVELOPMENT & PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE

- Consider re-designating other permanent open space areas in Oak Hills to Recreation (NC)
- Consider placing limits on timeshares (CC)(BS)
- Consider to re-designate Odello-West and Williams for Resource Conservation (map, 4.4.3.b.2, 4.4.3.E.4) (CC)
- Consider recommendation that drainage channels not be hardened (NC)
- Revise LUP map for Gorda, so that the Rural Community Center designation corresponds to the actual existing built –up commercial and administrative complex. (BS)
- Avoid sewage outfall discharges from impacting marine resources. (NC)
- Consider impacts of deleting housing option of Portrero Road Special Treatment area (5.2.1.G) (NC)
- Review temporary events policies (DMF)
- Analyze designated areas for/not for timber harvest (CC: BS)
- Redefine Caretaker units – definition needs to be reviewed and modified if needed. Need more flexibility to allow more caretaker units (BS)
- Consider including uniform policy on short-term rental use consistent with definition of dwelling (CW)
- Review conversions of visitor serving facilities [A-3-MCO-98-083](CW)
- There is a plethora of “monster” houses being built on the Monterey Peninsula. This should be discouraged not only for its aesthetic merits but because these homes usually replace more moderate homes that are more affordable to the average home buyer (CC, DMF)
- Consider monster home ordinances (CW)
- Land Use Element of LUP contradictory to other policies (LU emphasizes increased development) in other sections of LUP; County must ensure consistency among all elements (DMF)
- Consider imposing height limits in Otter Cove (BS)
- Consider appropriate limits on hotel development (CW)
- Develop adequate review of COCs and assess cumulative impacts of COCs and their impact on land use patterns (CW)
- Need for Monterey County to address uncertified areas (Malpaso Creek)(CW)
- Consider some sort of enforcement for farmers who encroach on riparian vegetation (NC)
- Desalination projects –the adverse affects associated with these types of projects (CW)



- Assess conversion of residential workshops to commercial enterprises (BS)
- Evaluate sewage and storm drain infrastructure systems in Monterey County that are lacking in necessary replacement and infrastructure maintenance. Physical upgrades should incorporate urban runoff as outlined in the Sanctuary's WQPP and Model Urban Runoff Program (CW)
- Assess methods to prevent overuse and preserve the natural resources and the carrying capacity of the beach and Sycamore Canyon Road. (BS)
- Transfer of Development Credits (BS)
- Transfer of water credits – evaluate accuracy in tracking amount used (CW)
- Review conflict between policies supporting Highways 1 & 156 widening and not allowing wetland fill (NC)
- Reevaluate existing use and available capacity of Moss Landing County Sanitation District waste water system (5.2.3 and Implementation Plan appendices) (NC)
- Assess protection of groundwater supply from new wells in Cal-Am service area (CC)
- Assess update of water supply policy and hence allowed buildout based on North Monterey County Hydrogeologic Study (NC)
- Consider and review prohibition of private wells in urban service areas; no private wells in urban service areas (CW)(S); Consider needs specific prohibition on wells (CC)
- Review adequacy of policies to prevent groundwater supply overdraft (NC)
- Assess transportation planning – consider Hwy 1 Bypass alternative (NC)
- Assess adequacy of roads, water, sewer for buildout (DMF)
- Evaluate impacts of demolition of historic homes and loss of community character (CC)
- Existing development and future development adding pressure to widen roads which yields more development in remote areas (BS)
- Evaluate whether the LUP's baseline information (on circulation, water, sewer, infrastructure) is accurate (DMF)
- Water rights (e.g., applications to the State Division of Water Rights to divert from Big Sur River)(CW)
- Measure A must be assessed against the LUP (DMF)
- Landslide debris management roadside storage volume vs. visual, coordinate w/Coast Highway Management Program recommendations (should be adopted end of 2003) (BS)
- Compact development/revitalization – should be a means to develop inside the cities before allowing out in rural areas; urban sprawl issue: lack of required infill, encourage increased density in urban areas to avoid urban sprawl (CW)
- Support county's growth management strategy- growth control/manage where growth occurs -roadside
- Consider how the Endangered Species Act may impact water supply (CW)
- Assess Flood control district projects potential degradation of habitat (CW)
- Need for Monterey County to address uncertified areas (Fort Ord) (CW)
- Review development in Ft. Ord will abide by HCP (NC)
- Assess controls on fertilizers/pesticides used in Ag (NC)
- Affordable housing (CW)
- Assess land use densities & building intensities standards (BS)



- Land trusts are the biggest roadblocks for making things happen (e.g. land trusts will not place conditions on land before transfer to state parks or other agencies for management, thereby infringing on local residents)(i.e., no provisions to ensure continued grazing etc. after land transfer)(BS)
- The acquisition of nearly 50,000 acres along the Monterey County coastal area provides strong incentive to lower the density and intensity of development in and around open space acquisitions. Limitations on size and height of dwellings and other structures should be enacted. (BS)
- Residential development and infrastructure has not kept pace with ever increasing population; the LCP needs to address this (CW)

ROAD CAPACITY & LAYOUT

- Consider providing parallel parking along Highway One for Monastery Beach (*revise 3.1.3.6*) (CC)
- Consider deleting the option for a new bridge south of existing Sandholdt bridge and for Harbor expansion in this area (*revise 5.2.1.H.4*) (NC)
- Review Hwy 68 traffic counts in policy 106 and update if necessary (DMF)
- Recognize the true character of Highway 1 through north Monterey County that a rural character designation does not reflect the true character of this segment; therefore think of safety concerns and allow for widening the highway to a four-lane highway as designated in the LCP (NC)
- Consider Hwy 68 & 1 interchange improvement (NC)
- External growth issues – growth pressures from outside the County are driving new development. Tourism and special events impact infrastructure (i.e. roads)(CW)
- Traffic – congestion, air quality due to increase in traffic, road capacity (CW)
- Consider non-motorized transportation modes for access and recreational resources (NC)
- Evaluate the purpose to improve capacity of Highway 1 & improve safety. Consider impacts on sensitive habitat areas (DMF)
- Consider impacts of access roads altering circulation patterns (DMF)

IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES

- Assess County drafting of LCP resolution methods, to ensure key language referencing Coastal Act is present (CW)
- Review temporary events policies (DMF)
- County should have pre-application meetings on site, prior to applications having to be filed; county should send project referrals to the Coastal Commission early on in the process. Condition terms should be defined (e.g. building envelop). (CW)
- School districts, state parks, national forest, other state and federal agencies need to be required to comply with the LUP & IP (BS)



- Feeling that providing input on the Periodic Review process is for naught, since the Commission can only make recommendations to the County, which will not ensure that deficiencies in the LCP will be addressed (BS)
- Review and ensure multiple definitions are internally consistent and consistent with those in the County Code as well (e.g., structure includes fencing in Carmel Area policy 2.2.4.9 but not in Title 20) (CW)
- Review County issued permits that may be CCC jurisdiction (CW)
- Determine if the County is not requiring easements along riparian corridor (CW)
- Update what recommended plans and services have and have not been accomplished (e.g., comprehensive natural resource and water basin management plan, comprehensive wetland management plan, etc.) (NC)
- Determine if County is providing sufficient background & detail on amendment submittal (CW)
- Consistent applications of regulations – amendments to the General Plan are not being applied in a consistent manner (CW)
- Review condition compliance methodology and implementation, improve enforcement of County permit requirements (CW)
- Review County staff determination of CalTrans project(s) considered not appealable (CW)
- Review and determine if the County is sending all permits Commission (CW)
- Denied project: property lot line adjustment, consider if minimum densities are not same as LCP requirement, potential impacts that would have allowed ridgeline development (w/o assessing alternatives), no requirement of biological survey when potential for environmental sensitive habitat exists (CW)
- Review exemptions of work from permit requirement, and any use of mechanized equipment in stream areas (NC)
- Regional coordination of plans – local cities don't coordinate their plans w/county and regional plans (CW)
- Review County submittal of all easement documents (CW)
- Review County determination of permits deemed not appealable, but may actually be appealable (CW)
- Consider issuance of variances w/o permit &/or appear liberal (CW)
- Consider including more specific findings that illustrate lot line adjustment permits in sensitive areas are consistent w/LCP policies (CC)
- Consider requiring latitude/longitude extent in permits, and the requirement for consultants to follow either CCC or county mapping conventions (CW)
- Assess takings analysis (CW)
- Assess/determine clarity on what requirements for a CDP (e.g. golf course maintenance, activities that impact resources) (DMF)

ENFORCEMENT

- No enforcement of development conditions (e.g., drainage, signage) (BS)



California Coastal Commission

Central Coast District Office

MCo ReCap Issues – Detailed

Page 15

- Viewshed policy is useless because there is no mechanism for enforcement/no means to implement (BS)
- Frustration that the Commission lacks enforcement powers concerning periodic review issues (BS)
- Permit processing & enforcement – pay planners better and retain them longer (BS)
- Coastal Act Enforcement policies (CW)
- Cooper Beach enforcement issue; issue went to the County then to the District Attorney's office then back to the County (BS)
- Illegal grading rampant especially for roads (BS)

MISCELLANEOUS

- Need more public participation and involvement, not sure how to motivate the public to attend meetings/hearings and become more involved in local planning issues (BS)
- Allowing the public the opportunity to participate in the process is of utmost importance (BS, CC)
- Government agencies need the ability to function in coastal zones (NC)